



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

•				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/305,234	05/04/1999	GEORGE V. GUYAN	AND1P068	1833
28164 75	90 09/17/2002		•	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			EXAMINER	
P O BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL	DIMELL CANGIEL C		AMUEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2175	
			DATE MAILED: 09/17/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u> </u>				
Advisory Action		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/305,234	GUYAN ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
<u>.</u>	,	Sam Rimell	2175		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		•		
There final r condit	REPLY FILED 03 September 2002 FAILS TO PLA fore, further action by the applicant is required to a ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (ion for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli 1) a timely filed amendment wh	ication. A proper reply to a lich places the application in		
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) [	The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date o	•			
have be 37 CFF (b) abo	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). tensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date en filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extent 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (e, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more content of the shortened (e).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1 asion and the corresponding amount of the distallatory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection.  HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  136(a) and the appropriate extension fee efee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in		
	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'	's Brief must be filed within the	period set forth in		
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d	they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.		
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):			
4.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed amendment		
5.🛛	The a) $\square$ affidavit, b) $\square$ exhibit, or c) $\boxtimes$ request for application in condition for allowance because: $\underline{Se}$		sidered but does NOT place the		
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	f to issues which were newly		
7.	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w				
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:			
	Claim(s) allowed:		•		
	Claim(s) objected to:				
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .				
_	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_	Λ		
8.	The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disap	proved by the Examiner.		
9.∐ 10.□	Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme Other:	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	Sam Rimell		
	and Trademode Office		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2175		







Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Lau ('247) does not disclose a client component. Examiner stated in the office actions of 5/9/01 and 6/3/02 that the client component was the set of structures defined by the reference numeral (300) in Lau. Applicant has not presented any arguments as to why this would not read as a client component. Applicant argues that Lau does not disclose a computer program for handling tasks. Each of claims 1, 8 and 15 state the invention is a computer program for developing software that handles tasks. Examiner maintains that the computer program developed by system of Lau can handle tasks, in particular, the task of handling insurance claims. Applicant further argues that the system of Lau does not permit the entry of user defined rules. As stated in the office actions dated 5/9/01 and 6/3/02, FIG. 5, pane 2 allows a user to define rules. The entry of the rules are performed at a user interface which is the computer (306) inside of the client component (col. 9, lines 50-53). This meets the exact requirements of claims 1 and 15, which call for the rules to be entered through the client component. Claim 8 does not define a client component. Applicant further argues that Lau does not necessarily generate a program that permits the entry of rules. However, neither the claims, nor the disclosure make any such suggestion. The function of entering rules is a function of the program which genrates software, not a function of the software which has been generated.